

**From:** David Lentz  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 11/17/01 8:06am  
**Subject:** Microsoft settlement comment

I suppose that since the basic verdict was already in place, the DOJ wasn't able to backtrack on that as well, and back away from the whole thing, telling Microsoft, "Sorry for the trouble, we'll not bother you any more."

My comments:

1) With Microsoft being convicted of predatory monopolistic behavior, I would have thought that it was too late for a "settlement" -- especially one that does nothing to discourage the same or worse behavior in the future (which is continuing at this moment), it does nothing to encourage free and open markets, and does nothing to compensate those identified parties (let alone the many companies damaged by Microsoft's illegal business tactics but not identified in the complaint) damaged by Microsoft (for instance, Netscape and the customers who bought Microsoft products).

Nice way to shake a convicted felon's hand, and tell them to carry on, the law won't trouble them any more.

2) As I understand it, the judge urged a speedy settlement, so as not to further damage the economy in a time of weakness. Exactly how does letting a convicted monopolist continue without change and without compensating those damaged by their past practices help the economy? I would have thought that busting up a monopoly would have helped the economy more than anything else. The breakup of the Bell System has certainly resulted in many more choices (along with lower prices) than we were getting when it controlled our telephone systems.

3) I would presume at this point, that the DOJ is going to further the cause of helping the economy by dismantling the antitrust enforcement unit and save the taxpayers some money. It certainly performs no useful function.

David Lentz  
15126 Count Fleet Ct  
Carmel, IN 46032  
davelentz@acm.org